

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 07523 01 OF 02 161942Z
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00
INRE-00 ACDE-00 DOEE-00 /026 W
-----115751 162003Z /73
O 161903Z MAY 78
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 9704
INFO AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY
AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 01 OF 02 GENEVA 07523

EXDIS USCTB

PASS DOE

E.O.11652:XGDS-3
TAGS: PARM US UK UR
SUBJECT: CTB NEGOTIATIONS: POLITICAL WORKING GROUP
MEETING, MAY 15, 1978
CTB MESSAGE NO.203
1. SUMMARY: AT MAY 15 POLITICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING
SOVIET REP (TIMERBAEV) TABLED REVISED SOVIET ILLUSTRATIVE
LANGUAGE ON OSI REQUESTS (SEPTTEL). SOVIET DRAFT WAS
BASED ON US DELEGATION'S ILLUSTRATIVE LANGUAGE PRESENTED
MAY 12 WHICH SOVIET REP CHARACTERIZED AS "QUITE A GOOD
STEP FORWARD." SOVIET TEXT WAS IDENTICAL TO US ON MANY
POINTS, INCLUDING KEY FORMULATION OF POSSIBLE NUCLEAR
EXPLOSION VICE "SEISMIC EVENT" AS BASIS FOR CONSULTATION
AND SUBSEQUENT OSI REQUEST. SOME PROBLEMS REMAIN: ON
ISSUE OF NON-SEISMIC EVIDENCE (NEW SOVIET LANGUAGE WOULD
PERMIT NON-SEISMIC EVIDENCE BUT APPARENTLY ONLY IN CON-
JUNCTION WITH SEISMIC EVIDENCE); ON TIMING OF AGREEMENT
ON INSPECTION AREA AND ON PRE-AGREED RIGHTS AND FUNCTIONS
BUT SOVIETS INVITED FURTHER DISCUSSION. ON THESE AND
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 GENEVA 07523 01 OF 02 161942Z

OTHER ISSUES, US REP (NEIDLE) REITERATED RATIONALE
UNDERLYING US POSITIONS. END SUMMARY.

2. AT MAY 15 POLITICAL WORKING GROUP, SOVIET REP
(TIMERBAEV) SAID REVISED US ILLUSTRATIVE LANGUAGE ON OSI
REQUESTS TABLED ON MAY 12 REPRESENTED "QUITE A GOOD STEP
FORWARD." HE PRESENTED SOVIET COUNTERDRAFT WHICH HE SAID

WAS BASED ON US LANGUAGE AND WAS QUITE CLOSE TO IT ESPECIALLY ON THE ISSUE OF PURPOSE AND USE OF NON-SEISMIC EVIDENCE. HE COMMENTED THAT SOVIET SIDE WAS STILL STUDYING THE ISSUE OF THE AGREED UNDERSTANDING. US REP (NEIDLE) EMPHASIZED THAT AGREED UNDERSTANDING WAS AN ESSENTIAL ELEMENT OF US VERIFICATION POSITION WHICH HAD BEEN APPROVED AT HIGHEST LEVEL. AT THE SAME TIME, HE WELCOMED REVISED SOVIET LANGUAGE AS A SIGNIFICANT NEGOTIATING STEP.

3. ENSUING DISCUSSION FOCUSED ON PRINCIPAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LANGUAGE OF THE TWO DRAFTS (USE OF NON-SEISMIC EVIDENCE, TIMING OF AGREEMENT ON AREA OF INSPECTION, AND PRE-AGREED RIGHTS AND FUNCTIONS). MOST OTHER DIFFERENCES IN TWO TEXTS WERE DISCUSSED BRIEFLY BUT DID NOT REVEAL MAJOR SUBSTANTIVE DIFFERENCES. IN RESPONSE TO A QUESTION FROM US REP, SOVIET DELOFF (BEZUMOV) SAID SOVIET LANGUAGE DID NOT EXCLUDE POSSIBILITY OF INTRODUCING NON-SEISMIC EVIDENCE BUT GAVE NO DIRECT ANSWER TO THE QUESTION OF WHETHER SEISMIC EVIDENCE WAS ALWAYS REQUIRED, OTHER THAN TO COMMENT THAT AS A PRACTICAL MATTER, SOME SEISMIC PHENOMENA WOULD ALWAYS BE ASSOCIATED WITH AN EVENT. HE APPEARED TO LEAVE THE DOOR OPEN FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION. SOVIET REP ADDED THAT IT WAS IMPORTANT THAT THERE BE NO DISCREPANCY BETWEEN LANGUAGE OF THE MULTILATERAL TREATY AND THE SEPARATE AGREEMENT, SINCE THE SOVIETS WOULD NOT WANT TO ACCEPT NON-SEISMIC EVIDENCE ALONE FROM PARTIES

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 GENEVA 07523 01 OF 02 161942Z

ADHERING ONLY TO THE MULTILATERAL TREATY. MOREOVER, SEISMIC DATA WOULD BE AVAILABLE IN MORE THAN 99 PERCENT OF THE CASES.

4. US REP EMPHASIZED THAT IT WAS POSSIBLE TO HAVE SERIOUS EVIDENCE EVEN IN THE ABSENCE OF SEISMIC DATA. EVEN IF NON-SEISMIC DATA WERE THE SOLE EVIDENCE IN ONLY A SMALL PERCENTAGE OF ALL CASES, SUCH A CASE MIGHT WELL BE PARTICULARLY IMPORTANT; FOR EVENTS OCCURRING BELOW THE SEISMIC DETECTION THRESHOLD WHICH WERE DETECTED BY OTHER MEANS, THERE COULD BE A QUESTION WHETHER SUPPRESSION OF A SEISMIC SIGNAL HAD OCCURRED AND IT MIGHT BE ALL THE MORE NECESSARY TO SEEK AN ON-SITE INSPECTION IN ORDER TO REMOVE DOUBT THAT A VIOLATION HAD OCCURRED AND TO STRENGTHEN PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE TREATY. HE SAID IN CONCLUSION THAT, ALTHOUGH VARIOUS DRAFTING FORMULATIONS COULD BE CONSIDERED IF A COMMON UNDERSTANDING EXISTED, IT WAS NOT YET CLEAR THAT THIS UNDERSTANDING HAD BEEN REACHED.

5. DISCUSSION ALSO REVEALED CONTINUING DIFFERENCES OVER ISSUE OF WHETHER THE OSI REQUEST SHOULD INCLUDE THE PRO-

POSED AREA OF INSPECTION OR MERELY IDENTIFY THE PLACE OF A SUSPECTED NUCLEAR EXPLOSION, AS WELL AS POSSIBLE DIS-AGREEMENT OVER THE RELATED ISSUE OF WHEN TO REQUEST SUPPLEMENTARY OSI RIGHTS AND FUNCTIONS. US REP STRESSED THAT ACCORDING TO OUR APPROACH, APPROXIMATE TIME AND LOCATION OF EVENT WOULD NORMALLY BE SPECIFIED DURING THE CONSULTATIONS PROVIDED FOR IN PARA 1 WHICH WOULD PRECEDE THE OSI REQUEST. AT THE TIME OF THE ACTUAL OSI REQUEST, THE REQUESTING PARTY WOULD MAKE CLEAR EXACTLY WHAT THE INSPECTION WOULD INVOLVE -- E.G. THE AREA OF INSPECTION,

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 07523 02 OF 02 161942Z

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00

INRE-00 ACDE-00 DOEE-00 /026 W

-----115752 162004Z /73

O 161903Z MAY 78

FM USMISSION GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 9705

INFO AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 02 OF 02 GENEVA 07523

EXDIS

AND THE DESIRED SUPPLEMENTAL OSI RIGHTS AND FUNCTIONS, BEYOND THE CORE RIGHTS AND FUNCTIONS AGREED UPON UNDER THE ORIGINAL AGREEMENT. SOV REP ASSERTED THAT IT WAS NOT LOGICAL TO SPECIFY THE POTENTIAL AEA OF INSPECTION AT SAME TIME AS THE LOCATION OF THE EVENT. SOVIET REP INDICATED THAT SINCE SOVIET SIDE WAS STILL STUDYING NEW US LANGUAGE ON AGREED RIGHTS AND FUNCTIONS, SOVIET LANGUAGE SHOWED NO CHANGE FROM TEXT OF MARCH 15, AND SOVS WOULD RETURN TO A CONSIDERATION OF THIS ISSUE LATER.

6. NOTING THAT THE SOVIET LANGUAGE SPECIFIED A TIME PERIOD OF SIXTY RATHER THAN THIRTY DAYS BETWEEN THE OSI REQUEST AND THE RESPONSE, US REP SAID 30 DAYS PROPOSED IN US LANGUAGE WAS ALREADY LIBERAL AND STRESSED DESIRABILITY OF NOT HAVING OSI REQUEST DRAG ON. SOVIET REP CITED SIZE, GEOGRAPHY AND CLIMATE OF USSR, AS WELL AS POSSIBLE NEED FOR DIFFICULT POLITICAL DECISION AFTER ALL THE TECHNICAL EVIDENCE WAS IN, (IF FOR EXAMPLE, THE AREA HAD SPECIAL SECURITY SIGNIFICANCE) AS REASONS WHY LONGER PERIOD WAS

NEEDED.

7. UK REP ASKED WHETHER SOVS ENVISAGED SOME DEFINITE
TIME PERIOD FOR REACHING AGREEMENT ON RIGHTS, FUNCTIONS,
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 GENEVA 07523 02 OF 02 161942Z

INSPECTION AREA AND OTHER ITEMS CITED IN PARA 5 OF THEIR
TEXT. SOVIET REP REPLIED THAT ALTHOUGH SOME TIME LIMIT
COULD BE CONSIDERED, IF THE BASIS FOR AN OSI HAD BEEN
AGREED ON AND THE POLITICAL DECISION HAD BEEN MADE TO
GRANT THE REQUEST, IT OUGHT NOT BE DIFFICULT TO AGREE ON
THE SUPPLEMENTAL ASPECTS. WARNKE

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 jan 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: NEGOTIATIONS, MEETINGS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 16 may 1978
Decaption Date: 20 Mar 2014
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 20 Mar 2014
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1978GENEVA07523
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X3
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D780206-1183
Format: TEL
From: GENEVA
Handling Restrictions:
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1978/newtext/t19780552/aaaabruk.tel
Line Count: 186
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: c8333e9c-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: ONLY
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: ONLY
Reference: n/a
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 27 jun 2005
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2672272
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CTB NEGOTIATIONS: POLITICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING, MAY 15, 1978 CTB MESSAGE NO.203
TAGS: PARM, US, UK, UR
To: STATE
Type: TE
vdkgvwkey: odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/c8333e9c-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Sheryl P. Walter
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
20 Mar 2014
Markings: Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014